

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **19 September 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-14. The rejections were maintained in the Advisory Action mailed on **6 November 2006**. Claims 8-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6, and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thatte et al (USPN 6,442,620, hereinafter "Thatte"). Claims 7, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thatte in view of Gibbons et al (USPN 5,761,511, hereinafter "Gibbons").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 8-21 were rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended claims 8-10 and 12-14 as suggested by the Examiner. Additionally, applicant has amended independent claim 8 to delete the previously added limitations as being redundant.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claims 4 and 11 were rejected as being anticipated by Thatte. Examiner avers that Thatte discloses "providing an additional factory for an extended component of the first invocation" at col. 11, lines 9-22). Applicant respectfully points out that Thatte teaches an **extensible object execution environment** (see Thatte, col. 11, lines 9-22).

In the Advisory Action mailed on **6, November 2006**, the Examiner avers that Thatte teaches that an extensible (additional) object execution environment (factory) of the COM+ services can be extended to incorporate additional domain-specific behaviors at col. 11, lines 9-14. Applicant respectfully points out that

extending an object execution environment is not the same as building a new factory.

The present invention generates an additional unique factory for building extensions of components (see paragraph [0028] of the instant application). This is beneficial because using a unique factory for building extensions of a component eliminates potential problems with initialization circularity. To break initialization circularity, the extended component must be registered before the base component. This is accomplished by registering a factory for the component rather than the component itself, and by a convention for a pattern of usage in which each base component registers itself by calling an instance method that is overridden in extended components. There is nothing within Thatte, either explicit or implicit, which suggests generating an additional unique factory for building extensions of components.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 8 to include limitations from dependent claims 4 and 11, respectively, to clarify that the present invention generates an additional unique factory for building extensions of components. These amendments find support in paragraph [0028] of the instant application


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 8 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-7, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 9-10 and 12-14, which depend upon claim 8, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 20 November 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com